

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/807,507	CHERIF, DORRA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenneth R. Horlick	1637	

All Participants:

(1) Kenneth R. Horlick.

(2) Frank Eisenschenk.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 July 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
 N/A

Claims discussed:
 11 and 42

Prior art documents discussed:
 N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
 See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the Office pointed out that in amended claim 11, the active method steps were not in agreement with the recited combinations of fluorophores and filter sets, because no detection step was recited. An examiner's amendment was agreed to addressing this issue by adding such a detection step. In addition, typographical errors were corrected in the first line of step "(c)" of claims 11 and 42, and "and" was added near the end of claim 42 to provide proper Markush format.✓